Syrian Invasion in Lebanon and the Related Issues

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—**Shibdas Ghosh**

VOL 9 | 15th JULY '76 | PRICE 30 P.
No. 22 | THURSDAY | Air Surcharge 4 P.

The situation in Lebanon is worsening day by day. The recent Syrian military intervention in Lebanon has dealt a severe blow to the semblance of Arab unity. The Syrian invasion of Lebanon and its attacks on the Palestinians gave a good-bye to the concept of Pan Arabism and all the good wishes of Arab unity against imperialism-Zionism. Now the Arabs are fighting the Arabs. The Syrian military has cracked down on the leftists and the Palestinians to forestal their imminent military victory over their adversaries, the Phalangists and other reactionary forces in the bitterest civil war in Lebanon. The attempts of the Arab League to enforce peace in Lebanon and also to restore Arab Unity are no doubt laudable but on the face of growing hostility between the rightist forces backed by the imperialists and the leftist and the nationalist section of the Lebanese people it is very doubtful if these attempts will bear any fruit. The pro-imperialist right wing forces are making a determined bid to annihilate the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (P.L.O.) from its last stronghold in Southern Lebanon. The result is the massacre of thousands of poor Lebanese and Palestinians. The streets of Beirut are littered with the corpses and there is small of gun powder everywhere. The Lebanese Left led by Kamal Jumblatt and the Palestinians are bitterly feeling that the Syrians have robbed them of their legitimate victory and tilted the balance in favour of the rightist forces. The present fighting would not have taken place and the fate of the civil war in Lebanon would have been decided in favour of the leftists and the Palestinians had not Syria intervened in the crucial phase of the civil war when they were at the door-step of the final victory. It was the Syrians who encouraged President Suleiman Frenjieh to cling to office. Therefore it is no wonder that the leftists and the Palestinians are smelling a Syrian-Israeli plot backed by the US imperialists, and it is also very clear that the Soviet revisionist leadership cannot also avoid its responsibility altogether.

The present tragedy in Lebanon is the result of the monstrous Imperialist-Zionist conspiracy to divide and dominate the Arab world with its vast petroleum resources. Since the creation of Israel with nearly two million of Arab inhabitants mercilessly butchered or uprooted from their fatherland all the Arab States have been officially at war with Israeli occupation and the tide of Pan Arabism which was sweeping through the length and breadth of the Arab world went a long way in uniting the Arab people. Though it is a fact that some of the proponents of Pan Arabism have themselves suppressed democratic movements and have tried to annihilate the progressive forces within their respective countries yet it cannot be denied that it is the Pan Arabism which played a positive anti-imperialist role and all the Arab countries supported the cause of the Palestinians. The Palestinians have been organising themselves in 'Al Fatah' movement and each and every Palestinian refugee have been transforming themselves into a death-defying Commando of the 'Palestinian revolution'. The Imperialist-Zionist circle correctly sensed the latent danger inherent in the 'Al Fatah' movement and was engaged in manoeuvring to crush this movement by creating rift in Arab unity. In this strategy of the Imperialist-Zionists, they discovered a ready ally in king Hussein of Jordan. The American-Israeli subversive agencies worked with their Arab agents to squeeze the PLO first out of Egypt and then out of Syria. King Hussein of Jordan ordered massacre of the Palestinian Commandos and thousands of Commandos were butchered in that operation

(Contd. to Page 2)

RED SALUTE TO COMRADE CHU TEH

The Politburo of the Socialist Unity Centre of India at its meeting on 7th July, 1976, expressed its deep grief and heart-felt condolence at the passing away of COMRADE CHU TEH, one of the veteran most leaders of the Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China, one of the builders of the People's Liberation Army and a most respected leader of the masses.

He remained a lifelong revolutionary and his death is a great loss not only to the people of China fighting for complete victory of Socialism but also to all people fighting against imperialism-capitalism all over the world.

EXPORT OF CAPITAL BY INDIAN MONOPOLY GROUPS : WHAT DOES IT IMPLY

In the issue, Vol. 9 No. 18, 15th May, 1976 of Proletarian Era, we commented on a news item about export of Indian capital through joint ventures abroad under the caption ; "JOINT VENTURES IN THIRD COUNTRIES : Indian Monopoly Capital a partner".

The very purpose of our writing was to help analysing the already developed imperialist character of Indian capital on the anvil of fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism linked with concrete materials.

For this, we quoted in our writing the five features enunciated by Lenin to distinguish imperialism as the special stage of development of Capitalism, with our emphasis on the third which is 'export of Capital' as distinguished from export of commodities.

While quoting the various demands of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industries (FICCI) from the report of the Economic Times of 21.1.76 which, inter alia, were for permission to export Indian capital directly for equity participation instead of through export of machineries etc. and 'political guarantee for investment abroad, we mentioned also the figure of direct foreign investments of the Indian capitalists to the tune of Rs. 41 crores in 133 effective projects out of the total approved joint venture projects of 233, a figure cited by the Indian Monopolists' own organisation i.e, FICCI. And on the basis of these concrete data we showed how correct was the observation and analysis of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and an eminent Marxist thinker of the era about the imperialist features developed in the character of Indian monopoly as far back in 1960. Comrade Ghosh has shown on the basis of concrete analysis that in its very process of development, Indian capital has not only reached the stage of monopoly capitalism but also finance capital and has given birth to financial oligarchy as also State monopoly capitalism. And it is now, though a junior partner, yet a partner, in the international trust and cartel of finance capital and has appeared as a competitor in the world capitalist market.

In the light of this reality, we appealed in our writing, to all those who called themselves 'Marxists' but showed their failure

(Contd. to Page 3)

SYRIAN INVASION IN LEBANON

(Contd. from Page 1)

which is known as 'Black September Massacre'.

Yet the movement grew in strength and gained significant victories in political, diplomatic and military fields and in the Islamic summit at Rabat in 1972, the Arab States gave the PLO official recognition as the authentic spokesman of Palestine and the UNO also was forced to allow Yasser Arafat, the PLO Chairman, to address the General Assembly in 1974.

The growing prestige and the political power of the PLO inspired the Palestinians within Israel and also in the areas occupied by the Israeli aggressors to rise in revolt against the oppression perpetrated by Israel. Israel as well as the US imperialists sensed the danger and saw an explosive threat to their neocolonial designs in the Middle East. This imminent danger prompted the Imperialist-Zionist circle to hatch out a conspiracy to liquidate the PLO from South Lebanon (Fatahland), the strongest hold of the PLO.

As a part of this grand conspiracy the Lebanese army was deployed against the Lebanese leftists and the Palestinian Commandos, but the Imperialist-Zionist circle saw to their dismay that the patriotic elements within the army revolted and joined the leftists and the Palestinian Commandos to swell their rank. When the army operation against them not only failed but it acted as a morale booster also, the Imperialist-Zionist circle left this task to the tripartite alliance of Lebanon comprising three pro-western parties like the National Liberation Party, the Phalangist Party and the National Bloc party. These parties were opposed to PLO's guerilla activities in Lebanon. But the left parties like the Communist Party, the Baath Party, the Progressive Socialist Party and the Arab Nationalist Movement not only supported but demanded conscription to prepare for a protracted popular war against Israel.

It is however needless to mention that the posture of neutrality by the tripartite alliance in the Arab-Israel conflict is nothing but a cover to hide their pro-US stand. Now the Phalangist Party of the tripartite alliance has a fascist organisational structure. With the storm trooper at its command the Phalangist Party triggered mad vicious killing of the Palestinians.

Now a few words must be said about the unjust economic system of Lebanon. Four percent of the rich control 60 percent of the total national wealth The disparity in wealth distribution is beyond description. The middle class is rapidly vanishing and entering the ranks of the working class and this leads to sharpening of class struggle. The Lebanese poor are gradually becoming aware of the cause of wide disparity between the rich and the poor. And the Palestinian movement has helped in making them enlightened. Attracted by the militant fervour of the PLO, which is also espousing their causes, the poor people think that perhaps their lot may be changed through what is known as "Palestinian revolution". So when the Phalangist storm troopers being backed by the US imperialists began to kill the Palestinians, the broad masses of the Lebanese poor sided with the Palestinians. So what initially looked like a medieval religious war or a communal riot like those which frequently occur in our country, sooner turned out to be a war between the rich and the poor. The patriotic and national forces of Lebanon were on the verge of victory against the Phalangists and other reactionary forces in the month of March last when Syria turned her guns against the patriotic and nationalist forces of Lebanon and tilted the balance in favour of the Phalangists.

Now what is the aim of Syria? Why the US imperialists and Israel back Syrian action in Lebanon? How is it that Syria can openly use Soviet arms against Palestinians with the full knowledge of the Soviet leadership? These are some of the pertinent questions which are disturbing the mind of every right thinking person. But these questions cannot be exactly answered unless the Syrian action in Lebanon is analysed in the overall perspective of the imperialist design in the Middle East, the policy of hegemonism persued by the Soviet revisionist leadership and the 'Al Fatah' movement or the uncompromising liberation struggle of the Palestinians.

The aim of the US imperialists is to dominate in the Middle East scene and control the rich petroleum resources of the Arab countries. With this aim in view the US imperialists want to turn the tide of anti-imperialism from the countries of the Arab world by creating rift among the people of these countries. But as has been already discussed the 'Al Fatah' movement is the greatest hurdle in achieving its objective. So the aim of the US imperialists is to contain and liquidate the PLO. The 'Sinai' accord and subsequently the Palestinian accord were the steps of the US imperialists in this direction. Through Sinai accord the US imperialists may be said to have partially drawn Egypt to its side and the semblance of unity of the Arab countries is thus broken. The Palestinian accord aimed at the creation of a federation of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon with a demilitarised rump of Palestinian state covering the West Bank and the Gaza strip. This federal project aiming at containing and ultimately liquidating the Palestinians was successfully sold to Syria through the king Hussein of Jordan and thus a closer relation developed between Jordan and Syria over this issue, as President Asaad of Syria and King Hussein of Jordan know it quite well that in the eventuality of such a federation taking shape, Syria and Jordan will dominate over Lebanon. But the Palestinians were not agreeable to this suicidal proposal. So it is the militant liberation struggle of the Palestinians, that is stalling all the solutions advantageous to the imperialists.

But the Syrian policy has undergone a near-sea change by this time. Till very recently Syria was supporting the leftists and the Palestinians in Lebanon. As a matter of fact in the previous Lebanese crisis, Syria intervened in support of the leftists and the Palestinians. At that time Syria took a militant posture against Israel and Israel on its turn was planning to attack Damascus. But this situation reversed with the growing strength of the leftists in Lebanon. President Asaad saw that these leftists would be a definite menace to his regime. With the growing leftist influence in Lebanon, the left movement within Syria and other Arab Countries would get a new impetus and the masses would be politicalised and their exploiting regimes would ultimately be overthrown. Moreover, from the attitude of the big powers, particularly the attitude of the Soviet revisionist leadership which is not in a mood to support militant anti-Zionist struggle and has been making underhand deal with the US imperialists to maintain status quo in Middle East, Syrian ruling class understood the futility of continuing war like confrontation with Israel at the cost of severe damage to her economy. So Syria is eager to implement the political solution as prescribed by the US imperialists. So the aim of the Syrian regime in its invasion against Lebanon is not to restore peace and a feeling of security in the country as has been claimed by Syria but to prevent leftist walk-over in Lebanon which is likely to endanger the present regime in Syria and also to push Arafat, the PLO chairman, to the wall and make him accept the fractured state of Palestine as proposed by the US imperialists.

Now what is the role of the Soviet Union in Lebanon in particular and in the Middle East in general? It is known to all that the Soviet Union played a most vital role in the Middle East politics and helped cementing the unity of the Arab people by its militant anti-imperialist stand and all-out support to the liberation struggle of Palestine during the era of Comrade Stalin. The consistent support to the struggle of the Arab people against Imperialism-Zionism by the Soviet Union at that period not only cemented the unity of the Arab people and boosted their morale but it also went a longway in giving a new impetus to the oppressed people all over the world in their fight against oppression and exploitation. But there has been a near sea-change in the policy of the Soviet Union since the revisionists usurped the leadership of the CPSU. The correct political attitude of the Stalin era is totally absent in the Middle East policy of the present revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. It is no doubt true that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union is also speaking of their support to the cause of the Arab people. But the credibility gap between what they are saying and what they are doing is widening sharply. The Soviet revisionist leadership, having been succumbed to the nuclear blackmailing of the US imperialist, is suffering

(Contd. to Page 7)

Capitalists Partition the World in Proportion

(Contd. from Page 1)

in grasping the imperialist character of Indian capital to take account of the concrete materials without any blinker and relate them to the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism as enunciated by Lenin in this regard. We expressed our hope that if they mind to do so "they would find that there is nothing like 'semi-feudal' or 'comprador' that can be associated with the characterisation of Indian economy or Indian national bourgeoisie" at the present stage of development.

It is however interesting to note that CPI(M) in its organ 'People's Democracy' (Vol. 12 No. 22 of May 30, 1976) that is to say, just fortnight after our writing, has dealt the same subject e.g. export of Indian capital through joint ventures abroad under the caption, "Private Investments Abroad". From the very tone and tenor as also the central theme, this writing in CPI(M)'s organ hardly leaves anybody in doubt as to what it is defending and for that whom it has chosen as target of attack.

Let us see what the CPI(M)'s organ writes

It writes *"Influence exerted by monopoly groups* and their export of capital *have to be sufficiently heavy to bring the recipient countries under the imperialist pale. Domination is the central point in this relation. But Indian monopoly groups are no where near dominating the countries where they have exported capital".* (emphasis ours—Ed. P. Era)

After thus presenting what can be said a peculiar version about imperialism where the correct Marxist understanding or to be specific, the five features enunciated by Lenin are no longer valid but 'domination is the central point' CPI(M)'s organ deliberately shows on the low side, the volume of Indian finance capital exported in overseas markets through joint ventures by picking up the figure of Rs. 34 crores supplied by some Deputy Minister in the Lok Sabha, in preference, to the figure of Rs. 41 crores supplied by the Indian monopolists' own organisation, F.I.C.C.I. which came out in the Press and was quoted by us in our writing. The motive behind this exercise of deliberately showing the volume of Indian capital exported by the monopolists on the low side is not kept secret. Because CPI(M)'s organ immediately jumps to the deduction that "this is altogether a very insignificant sum when foreign investments of imperialist countries are noted", as if the volume of finance capital working in foreign countries determines the fundamental question as to the nature of exploitation of cheap labour power and raw materials by the finance capital in these foreign markets ! Still then, while proposing a comparison of the figure of the volume of foreign investments of Indian monopoly groups with those of other imperialist cauntries, CPI(M)'s organ just forgets to quote other figures of noted imperialist countries after quoting the figure of USA only, which, as everybody knows, is a leading imperialist country, to-day.

After thus contrasting the figure of foreign investment of Indian monopolists to that of the USA, and referring to some of the difficulties as also weaknesses of Indian finance capital in outside market, CPI(M)'s organ thinks that it has no difficulty to come to the solemn conclusion (!) thus :

"The weak position of Indian Capital in these countries is obvious and *it is miles away from the position of domination. If thinking by rote somebody proposes that export of Indian capital may bring In its train Indian Imperialism, he is making himself ridiculous".* (*Emphasis ours-Ed. Pro. Era.*)

According to CPI (M) then, at this stage of monopoly capitalism in Indian economy, export of finance capital by the financial oligarchy or 'monopoly capitalist groups' as they use the term, to foreign markets obviously with the motive of earning profit, by exploiting the cheap labour power and raw materials, are not sufficent proof of the imperialist character of this exploitation as enunciated by Lenin but 'Domination' of such exploitation in foreign markets is the 'central point' in determining the very imperialist character of such exploitation ! That is to say, according to CPI(M), in order to be imperialist in the very nature of exploitation, the finance capital exported by a country at the stage of monopoly capitalism, must be dominating in those countries, otherwise however much this finance capital may exploit the labour power and raw material in these countries, this exploitation cannot be brought under the definition of imperialist exploitation. CPI (M) therefore holds that as the exported Indian finance capital is yet 'miles away from the position of domination,' it would be 'ridiculous' not only to hold that Indian capital has already attained imperialist character but also to hold that 'export of Indian capital may bring in its train, Indian imperialism !'

Before examining such a queer concept of CPI(M) in this regard, may we ask a simple question what purpose did exactly work behind their taking such a stand ? Is it only a vain attempt to conceal the already developed imperialist features in the character of Indian finance capital from the masses or is it something even more than that ? Have they cared to note that by this proposition they are extending, may be in a round-about way, their full support for the export of capital by the monopolists of India abroad particularly in the Afro-Asian and Middle-East countries to exploit cheap labour power and the raw materials of the recipient countries till it asumed the position of domination ? Indeed they are. It will be crystal clear if one closely examines the para 108 of their Party programme where they pledged on behalf of the working class and toiling masses their "unstinted support" to the Government and the Indian big bourgeoisie in the event of conflit between them and the foreign imperialist.

Why we say so ? We say this because the fundamental point of issue while discussing the character of export of capital as distinguished from export of commodity by the financial oligarchy at the stage of monopoly capitalism in Indian economy, must be to determine the very character of this exploitation of cheap labour power and raw materials in foreign market by the capital exported and show its imperialist character according to the scientific teachings of Marxism-Leninism as has been enunciated by Lenin. This is what we did in our writing.

So, the question was not to ascertain which among the imperialist countries exporting capital in a particular recipient country enjoyes a dominant position. The question of domination is only relevant to that point.

For, it is altogether a different issue as to whether an imperialist country exporting capital to foreign market is dominating by sheer volume of capital in the said market in over-all position or relatively over other imperialist countries exporting capital in the same market. But here again, this conception of domination of an imperialist power in a country by sheer volume of capital export is entirely a wrong understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

In this era of imperialism, it would be wrong to hold that it is only volume of capital that an imperialist country exports to a particular recipient country that alone determines its influence or domination in that country as CPI(M) has tried to make out. It is well kown to the Marxists as Lenin pointed out, in this era of imperialism, "politics must take precedence over economics and to argue otherwise is to forget A B C of Marxism" (Lenin-Collected Works—Vol. 32, pp 83-84). By domination therefore the correct Marxist understanding would be the political influence that an imperialist country is exerting over a particular recipient country where it is exporting capital along with other imperialist countries. Bare facts and events will also bear out this truth.

Any body conversant with facts knows, that the total volume of U. S. finance capital working in some of the Afro-Asian countries is still less in comparison with the volume of British or French finance capital but still then U. S. political influence or domination in those particular countries is clear.

to Capital, in proportion to Strength

Say for instance, in Pakistan or even in India how is it that the US political influence supersedes the economic power of British finance capital which is still higher than that of US finance capital in volume ? Is it not in recognition of this incontrovertible fact that CPI(M) is concentrating its fire not so much against the British capital as against the US capital ? But facts remain, of the estimated total volume of foreign capital working in India to the tune of Rs. 1612 Crores in 1969 (People's Democracy—June 27, '76) the volume of US capital was about Rs. 316 crores in 1973 (According to the Back-ground paper of FICCI at the Indo-US

(Contd. to Page 6)

ON THE PROPOSAL OF SETTING UP OF WORKERS' SECTOR

The other day, Finance Minister C. Subramanium, while piloting the Additional Emoluments (Compulsory deposit) Amendment Bill, 1976 announced in the Lok Sabha that after preliminary exercise, the Government had "expounded the idea of setting up a Fifth sector —the workers' sector— where the impounded dearness allowance of over one crore employees amounting to Rs. 1,000 crores could be invested" (The Economic Times— 20. 5. 76). He said, if the economy had private, public, joint and co-operative sectors, "why not we have a Workers' Sector ?"

In an apparent justification of the underlying factors prompting this move of the Government, he claimed that his proposal was a prelude to massive participation in investment by the workers, besides lending a real meaning to workers' participation in management. In tune with the ' .... theory' of containing spiralling inflation by restricting wages he waxed eloquent, if repayment of impounded amounts would not lead to inflation with higher prices chasing dearness allowance and vice-versa or if this amount was repaid, would it not go into consumption and be frittered away. Our readers are well conversant with our analysis on the underlying reasons of inflation in general and spiralling inflation in a capitalist economy ... . in particular, which appeared in our previous issue dated 15th August '74. We need not, therefore, repeat it any more. Suffice it to note that .... the monopolists' highest organisation FICCI has taken note of the .... recessionary impact on the industrial production as a result of declining purchasing power of the workers and employees, ... Now what we owe to our readers is to critically examine how far the 'Fifth Sector' is a panacea in the pursuit of Government's declared objective of achieving socialism, and "imparts dignity to the working class" to quote the Finance Minister's expression.

Let it be noted first that workers' dignity when talked of in a capitalist society is a mere sop calculated to place the workers in a sophisticated means of wage slavery Such means have been adopted by various bourgeois countries in Europe and the U.S.A. at this third stage of acute crisis of capitalism. But the real dignity of the workers can be established only with the end of wage slavery when the workers are able to free production and all the means of production from the tentacles of profit motive of the capitalist class in a truly socialist society where instead of being slaves they become the real master of the productive system. Let us recapitulate in brief, some of the bourgeois methods that have been applied to delude the working people to a submission to the exploitation of capitalism in the West European bourgeois countries and the U. S. A. We are in the know that the most common form of capital sharing is the sale of a firm's shares to its employees. Knowing that a small share holder has no say in a firm's affairs, the leaders of the capitalist economy hope that several shares in an employee's possession will help to give him a capitalist outlook and that they will be able to distract him from the class struggle and make him interested in increasing profit. Besides, the employer at times, instead of raising wages, gives shares to its employees too. The perpose is to reduce the working people's consumption fund by increasing the investment fund without competitive investment rate. Such experiments have been made in the USA, France, West Germany etc. France brought an ordinance entitled : "Stimulation of the Working People's Association or Interest in an Enterprise" on January 7, 1959.

The ordinance envisages three ways of using the fund :

(i) to increase an enterprise's fixed assets ;

(ii) to make investments into a special investment fund of an enterprise ;

(iii) to make investments into investment bodies that are independent of an enterprise.

French specialists showed by calculation that the dividends the workers received from such investment were only 1.25 p.c. compared to the wage erosion due to rise in cost of living which was 7 p.c. on an average within a period of ten years from the introduction of the scheme.

Another variety was the Leber Plan (named after George Leber, a reformist trade union leader) in West Germany according to which every wage and salaried worker would be given a share in capital ownership of a firm. In short, the capitalist should deposit 1. 5 p.c. of the employee's pay in a special fund which would be at his disposal but would be regarded as workers' property. Workers would be given share bond and can receive the money due to them when they go on pension due to disability or old age. Leber, however, favoured share to pass down to the descendants by inheritance also. On the model of this Leber Plan, West Germany passed an Act, "Promotion of the Creation of Property for Wage-workers Act" on July 1, 1965, whereby the accumulated sum from workers pay was registered as loan to the capitalist but they cannot demand it back for at least five years normally. This was dished out as a unique alternative to the socialist road of development of society or "*Socialism democratically achieved*".

But even to a reformist social-democratic British ideologist G.D.H. Cole, it was revolting inasmuch as its pretentious motive too was inadequate. Cole observed : "As a socialist, I am against capitalism and all its works and the last thing I should wish to do would be to turn the labourers into an inferior sort of capitalists, or to entangle the workers into acceptance of a superficially amended system of capitalist exploitation".

(G. D. H. Cole—The case for Industrial Partnership—London 1957 : P. 51).

Such is the fate of the dream of "Workers' Paradise" through subterfuges like this capital sharing as has been corroborated by experiences in European bourgeois democracies.

In the instant case of workers' participation in the management as proposed by the Finance Minister there is another view point which needs careful examination. This will, at one stroke, raise the question as a journal notes, among others, that investment in the shares of a large-number of loss-making or low-profit making companies may not be a worthwhile proposition for the workers, contrary to wishful thinking. "...Administratively, the scheme will be simplest to operate if something like a separate corporation is set up and the investments of repayments of the impounded wages are made over to it for investment. With such an arrangement, however, it will be difficult to pretend that the investment of the impounded wages will strengthen so called workers' participation in management....."

—(Economic & Political Weekly-May 22, 1976)

"The Corporation in question will therefore be another source of institutional finance for industry— a variant of the Unit Trust"—(Ibid).

So, mere creation of financial institution with the capital created out of the impounded wages of the workers and employees having for its sole object providing liquid funds to the firms and enterprises can mean proliferating such lending institutions for the capitalists, in the alternative, investing the sum outright in firms and enterprises or in cooperative with the same objective of earning capitalist profit does not change a bit the position of the workers in a capitalist system. The basic motive force of production and the relation of production are not affected in the least by such manoeuvre. The workers remain the same, ... Constitution of a board with some so-called representatives of the workers does not alter this basic reality.

But for the working people, this kind of exercise comes with a newer challenge to their class-consciousness. They must not fall victim to any sort of illusory hopes but should remain steadfast in achieving the sublime goal of end of wage slavery that can come with the end of capitalism whereupon the era of real 'dignity of man' will usher in on definite objective conditions.

Public Sector Flourishes

Since adopting the programme of setting up of public sector as a vital economic policy of the country much apprehension was there as to the success or feasibility of the plan. But to the pride of the policy makers, it has now proved successful enough in so far as the real purpose of the ruling class is concerned. Public sector has proved itself profitable—not simply in economic terms only, but in other and broader sense too.

In spite of some primary setbacks which may also be attributed to, in economic term, as gestation lag, public sector in India has definitely flourished since its inception in 1951. On April 1, 1951 there were only five enterprises in the public sector with an investment of Rs. 19 crores only and on March 31, 1975 the sector comprised of 129 enterprises with an investment of Rs. 7,261 crores, all under the Central Government, not to speak of the State Government undertakings. During the financial year 1974-75 the total turnover and gross profit earned were as much as Rs. 10,217 crores and Rs. 559 crores respectively. [Figures quoted from an extract of the Annual Report (1974-75) of the Bureau of Public Enterprises on Central Government Undertakings presented to the Parliament—Published in the Business Standard dated 16. 6. 76].

But in a broader and also truer sense, a public sector organisation may be wholly owned by the Central Government, by a state government or partly owned by them or may be run as a statutory Corporation or as a public limited company. And in this sense, according to the "Commerce Year-book of the Public Sector, 1974-75" the public sector as a whole under all the above categories of ownership and form, possessed gross tangible assets of nearly 22 thousand crores rupees. Its annual gross fixed capital formation ran at the rate of Rs. 3,600 crores and contributed over 800 crores rupees to annual savings (i.e. profit). These figures relate to the year 1972-73. During the same year, the contribution of the public sector industry to the net domestic product was estimated at nearly Rs. 3,400 crores. Out of every three persons employed in the organised sector in our country, two are engaged in the public sector, aggregating about one crore and twenty four lakhs employees. And in 1976 all the figures must have gone much higher. [From an article by Sri Bagharam Tulpule in the Economic and Political Weekly dated 29.5.76.]

Not only in the volume of production, capital invested, profit earned and man-power employed but also in other important respects public sector has been playing a very significant role in the overall economy. A large part of it operates in sectors of basic and most vitally important to the industrial and economic activities of the country like Steel, Coal, Power, Banking, Insurance, Oil, Shippings, Airlines, Heavy Electricals, Heavy Engineering, Basic Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals, Fertiliser and Food Grain Trading etc. The state enterprises have not only effectively penetrated into these vital or key sectors of the country's economy but also, as everyone knows, have mostly monopolised the vital sectors and have been able to establish itself so as to control these important sectors of the economy. Thus within this span of 25 years the State has been itself the biggest owner of the means of production in the country.

However in the history of development of capitalism, monopoly capitalism and state monopoly capitalism this kind of concentration and building up of huge economic power in the hands of a capitalist state is nothing new. Correctly and scientifically observing and analysing the very process of development of capitalism and capitalist state at their very onset the great Marxian Philosopher Engels laid bare the truth hidden in the above phenomenon and analysed its real character. He said in this context: "At a certain stage of development even this form (i. e. joint stock company formation—Ed. P. Era) no longer suffices; the official representative of capitalist society, the state, is constrained to take over their management. This necessity of conversion into state property makes itself evident first in the vast institutions for communication: the postal service, telegraphs and railways.... But the transformation, either into joint stock companies and trusts or, into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint stock companies and trusts this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organisation that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the general internal conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well as of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceedes to the taking over of the productive forces, the more does it become the national capitalist, ... The workers remain wage-workers—proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. (Anti-Duhring, Part III-Socialism II-Theoretical Page 384) For, so long as the state power is in the hands of the capitalist class the ultimate ownership of the means of production, whatever be its forms, within the capitalist set-up remains essentially in the hands of the capitalist class as a whole—though not in the hands of an individual capitalist or monopolist.

And this truth is experienced in all fields of operation of public sector —profit making and production relation, utilization of the economic power built up thereof. Here too, owner-wage earner production relation is maintained, labour power is expropriated and maximum possible profit is earned, profit earned is further employed to expand the volume of capital and to earn further profit—all with the same capitalist motive force of production to earn maximum profit.

So, those who cannot conceive the character of this state monopoly capitalism have perhaps forgotten firstly the truth that until and unless the present bourgeois economic system essentially with the capitalist motive force of production to earn maximum profit and the owner-wage earner relation of production is fundamentally changed, bourgeoisie is overthrown and the dictatorship of the proletariat is established through the completion of socialist revolution nothing like socialism can be expected. Moreover, they have failed to take the lessons of history also. Now in this present stage of crisis of world imperialism-capitalism, specially after the Second World War, crisis of capitalism has much more accentuated. In this third phase of intense general crisis, the the world capitalist market has lost even the relative stability it enjoyed before the Second World War and side by side faced with mounting surge of anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist revolutionary movements in colonies, semi-colonies and capitalist countries all over the world. Under such circumstances, the ruling bourgeois class of all capitalist countries with its traditional form of economic organisation, political institution and administrative apparatus are failing to cope with this ever mounting capitalist crisis and to keep the basic law of earning maximum profit of capitalist economy operative are throwing aside all veils of parliamentary democracy and tending to the path of establishing Fascism. In this respect what Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, one of the eminent Marxist thinkers of the era and our beloved leader and teacher and General Secretary said, must be noted here. He said: These historical conditions impart to Fascism some common characteristics, which are its distinguishing features. *They are mainly economic centralisation, maximum concentration of political power in the state, rigid firmness in administration —all leading to more and more identification of the state with the interest of the monopolists—and cultural regimentation.....*

And the same process of concentration of private capital development of state capital, fusion of the two into state monopoly capitalism, thereby reducing the state subservient to the monopolists and reduction to the minimum of mutual competition between individual capitalists through planning etc. as is found in the advanced capitalist countries, is at work in the backward countries also, though for different purposes. *The powerful capitalist countries have taken to militarised economy and centralisation of capital to get out of their crisis in over-production, excess capital and market whereas the backward capitalist countries are after concentration of capital and planning in order to achieve rapid industrial development to catch up with the powerful capitalist countries and emerge as their strong competitors in the foreign market. But all the same both the advanced and the backward capitalist countries, pressed by the circumstances, are laying the economic base of Fascism.*

['Call of the Hour', Socialist Unity, Vol. 1. No. 1, (New series), July 1962—emphasis in the original]

(Contd. from Page 3)

Joint Council meet). Whereas therefore, the British have larger volume of finance capital in India the political influence of USA far supersedes this economic power.

Now according to CPI(M), domination of an imperialist country, in a particular recipient country means either of two things. It may mean that the total volume of capital that an imperialist country is exporting to a particular recipient country exceeds the total volume of indigeneous capital of that country or it may mean that of the various imperialist countries exporting capital to a particular recipient country one imperialist country is dominating because of sheer heavier volume of capital. And CPI(M) holds that upon fulfilling either of these conditions is to be determined the basic character of imperialist exploitation of cheap labour power and raw materials by the finance capital exported to a particular recipient country by a country which is at the stage of monopoly capitalism and with financial oligarchy working at the back. This is simply preposterous, because as bare facts would reveal that logical conclusion from either of this two propositions of CPI(M) is simply fantastic nonsense. For, if we take the first proposition i. e. the character of exploitation of the labour power and raw materials in a recipient country by the finance capital exported by a country at the stage of monopoly capitalism and the financial oligarchy working at the back is not imperialist unless the capital so exported exceeds the total volume of capital of that particular recipient country, then we are to conclude that none of the finance capitals working in India having their origin in the U. K., Japan, West Germany, France and even the U.S.A. is guilty of imperialist exploitation as not to speak of the total volume of capital of each of these countries, even the aggregate volume of finance capital of all these countries taken together constitutes only 16 P. C. of the total capital working in the industrial sector of Indian economy (vide Economic Times Annual—1975). Then again, take the second proposition i.e. that only among several imperialist countries exporting finance capital to a particular recipient country, that country alone is engaged in imperialist exploitation which has a domination over the other capital exporting countries by the relative volume of capital export, then we are to conclude that none other than the U. K. is imperialist and that the finance capitals of France, West Germany, Japan and even of USA are not guilty of imperialist exploitation. What a pathetic discomfiture for these sham 'Marxists.' !

Now what relevance this issue of domination of an imperialist country has got with the basic question of determining the very character of imperialist exploitation ? The issue of domination, at best, may have relevance as to against which of the imperialist powers, exerting domination, that the people of the oppressed country would direct their fire. Other than the purpose of muddling, it has no logical bearing on the basic issue of determining the imperialist character of exploitation when we discuss the character of export of capital as distinguished from export of commodities by monopoly capitalist groups under condition of monopoly capitalism with financial oligarchy working at its back. Is it not the fundamental question in determining the imperialist nature of exploitation by capital because of which Lenin took particular care to differentiate the character of export of capital from export of commodity ? Is it not a fact that in determining the special phase of capitalist developement which is imperialism, Lenin stressed on "concentration of production, the monopolies arising there from, the merging or coalescence of bank with industry" which is the history of the rise of finance capital and that "domination of capitalist monopolies inevitably becomes the domination of a financial oligarchy" ? Is it not a fact that Lenin showed the typical feature of imperialism in the export of capital behind which this financial oligarchy is at work as distinguished from simple export of commodity which was the typical feature of old competitive capitalism ?

For what purpose then, CPI(M) is dodging this correct Marxist understanding, if not, to conceal the imperialist character of exploitation of what they say Indian 'Monopoly Capitalist Groups' in foreign markets ? Does CPI(M) mean therefore that this export of capital by the financial oligarchy is not for exploitation of labour power and raw materials in the recipient countries but is purely dictated by altruistic urge ? Otherwise why it seems 'ridiculous' to CPI(M) to hold that "export of capital (finance capital—Ed. P. Era) will bring in its train Indian imperialism" ? Is it not amazing as also amusing to hear from a 'Marxist' Party to know that Indian monopolists' export of capital to foreign market is not dictated by profit motive but by altruism ? What then is the character of the earnings by way of royalty, dividends, fees etc. of the Indian capital working abroad and repatriated to home country that runs to several crores of rupees which is even reported in burgeois papers ? Why then FICCI the Indian monopolists' own organisation is demanding of the Government, political guarantee against possible forfeiture or nationalisation for their capital invested in foreign markets ? Do all these smack of altruism as CPI(M) suggests ?

The purpose of CPI(M) is obvious enough in another aspect of this exercise. After holding that imperialism does not become imperialism unless the volume of capital export, or for that matter, the sphere of exploitation of this volume of capital export assumes a dominant position in recipient country, CPI(M) shows deliberately on the low side, the volume of foreign investment of Indian monopolists. Why it does so ? Is it to take a longer time for continuing their "unstinted" support to the monopolists, in their fight against the foreign imperialists to have strong foot-holds in the recipient countries ? Or is it to stress on the need of rallying far more support and assistance behind the Indian monopolists so that they can achieve this goal of domination within shorter time ?

Whatever may be the reason of the two, CPI(M) is asking their rank and file as also the working people to shut their eyes to the fact of increasing volume of foreign investment of the Indian monopolists which is coming to light through various reports in different papers and periodicals. Although therefore, it has got nothing to do with the main question as to the determination of the imperialist character of exploitation as we have shown, let us note in passing a fact which CPI (M) wants to suppress for obvious reason.

Mr. K. Balakrishnan has quoted in his article 'Indian Joint Ventures Abroad' [Economic and Political Weekly—May 29, 1976] the figure of direct foreign investment in joint venture project abroad by the Indian capitalist to be of the order of Rs. 51.79 crores after giving a list of 43 countries where these joint venture projects (239 altogether) are either operating or are in different stages of completion. In an earlier figure of RBI in August, 1961, the total assets of Indian concerns over and above the joint ventures were estimated to be of Rs. 235 crores. These figures are therefore tentative in nature.

According to a report of the Economic Times (June 3, 1976) there is now a spurt in capital export from India, particularly in the Middle East. In Iraq alone 2'5 billion dollar (Rs. 2,300 crores) of which one billion dollar or Rs. 900 crores already contracted, will go for construction of complete railway system to link Baghdad to Hasaiba as also with the sea-port Basarah. In Nigeria also, the expected volume of capital export will be of the order of Rs. 1000 crores in construction of complete railway system and where already a dozen of Indian railway experts' services have been commissioned to man the railway administration. Related to this, is another report in the Economic Times (May 28, 1976). The Executive Director of the IDBI has let known in the Press that the international finance wing of the Bank has become the focal point for the clearance of the big projects abroad undertaken by the Indian firms running to hundreds of crores of rupees through consortia of firms set up for the purpose. He also informed that at present, the international finance wing is financing the construction of pipe line in Kenya in association with Japan's Exim Bank

(Contd. to Page 7)

Strength of Capital varies according to the degree of economic and political development of the country exporting capital

(Contd. from Page 2)

from the nuclear war phobia and because of their hegemonistic aspiration they worked hand in glove with the US imperialists in the Middle East politics. This is why they refused to provide Egypt with those effective arms which alone could thwart the Israeli aggression in the Arab-Israel conflict. Moreover, the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union co-sponsored a most humiliating cease-fire resolution along with the US imperialists and thrust the same on Egypt at a most disadvantageous moment of her war with Isreal in 1973. And what was the result ? The result definitely went in favour of the imperialists. By this policy the Soviet revisionist leadership indirectly helped the US imperialists to gain prestige in the Middle East.

Now it is seen that on the very next day of the Syrian invasion over Lebanon Mr. Kosygin is pledging continued arms aid to Syria at a banquet in Damascus by saying : "We shall go on helping our Syrian friends in increasing their military defence capabilites" (The Statesman, dated 3.6.76). From this if one concludes that the Soviet revisionist leadership wants to handle Israel by containing the PLO activities through Syria, will it then be a wrong presumption ?

Incidentally it may be mentioned that the CPI(M) leadership is, however, attempting to hide this role of the Soviet revisionist leadership from the people and the rank and file of their party. In the 'People's Democracy', the English organ of the CPI(M), it has been stated : "It is time for all the progressive forces of the Arab world to help the people of Lebanon to settle their differences among themselves in a peaceful manner, without any unnecessary intervention from outside.

"The Communist Parties of the world and the Governments of the Socialist Countries—including the Soviet Union and China—are all agreed on this point" (People's Democracy, dated 20 6.76).

Syrian Invasion in Lebanon

When the Syrians attacked the Palestinian Lefts in Lebanon with Soviet arms, the Soviet leaders did neither impose any codition on Syria not to use Soviet arms against the Palestinians, nor did they threaten, in such an eventuality, to stop all military help in future. They, on the contrary, assured the Syrian leaders, even in face of such brutal attacks by Syria against Lebanon, with continued arms aid in future. Does this fact tally with CPI (M)'s observation that Soviet Russia, like all the Communist Parties of the world and the Socialist State like China, is really opposed to interference in Lebanon ?

So the CPI(M) leadership is giving a good certificate to the Soviet Union in spite of such open pledge to Syria by Mr. Kosygin of continued Soviet military aid to that country on the very next day of Syrian invasion over Lebanon. By unnecessarily dragging the name of China, which is, of late, sparingly mentioned by the CPI(M), the CPI(M) leadership is trying to project a good image of the Soviet revisionist leadership by concealing their ugly misdeeds in Damascus from the people and the rank and file of their party.

Soviet Revisionist Leadership Moving hand in glove with Imperialist Powers in the Middle East

At present the Soviet revisionist leadership instead of speaking about the uncompromising armed struggle against Zionism and complete victory over the imperialist Zionist forces is, on the contrary, urging the necessity of a 'matured solution' of the Middle East problem. It is clear that the Soviet revisionist leadership wants to maintain the present balance of the super-powers in the Middle East. But the militant stand of the PLO is a definite hindrance to this objective of the Soviet revisionist leadership. Is it because of this reason that the Soviet revisionist leadership is putting pressure on the PLO through Syria ? What will the Soviet revisionist leadership answer if one charges them that they are also a party in making the Palestinians swallow the bitter pill of the fractured state of Palestine consisting of the West Bank and the Gaza strip only as prescribed by the U. S. imperialist in the name of peace and security in the region ? What else other than the policy of hegemonism on the part of the Soviet revisionist leadership can explain this unique convergence—the convergence in approach between the U. S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionist leadership—in the international politics ? The PLO must remain alert about the double standard of the Soviet revisionist leadership. While they have been showing lip sympathy to the cause of the Palestinians and allowing the opening of PLO mission in Moscow, this revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union is, at the same time, sending military hardware to Syria to crush their last stronghold in Lebanon. When the Palestinians, having been squeezed out of Egypt, Syria and Jordan are defending their last stronghold in Southern Lebanon against the bloodiest onslaught of the Imperialist-Zionist backed forces, the Soviet revisionist leadership is arming Syria to crack down on the Palestinians, a nation in exile, a nation in deep anguish and trial because of the imperialist machinations. The glorious liberation struggle of the Palestinians who are detached from their home land, badly mauled and relegated *en masse* to a world of nothingness by the Imperialists-Zionists, is thus facing the combined onslaught of imperialism and modern revisionism. The liberation struggle of Palestine and Arab people once again proves the correctness of the teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, one of the foremost Marxist thinkers of this age and the leader and teacher of our party, about modern revisionism, on various occasions in the past. Let us quote below the teaching of Comrade Ghosh about modern revisionism on the occasion of party foundation day on 24th April, 1975. Comrade Ghosh said "...Since Khrushchev and his clique usurped the leadership of the CPSU, the CPSU and the Soviet Union gradually started shifting from the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line of approach to an out and out revisionist line. .....Now they are only extending lip services to the anti-imperialist liberation struggles in colonies and semi-colonies and revolutionary struggles in the capitalist countries. Even when they were forced to extend support and help to the national liberation struggles, one could easily see that they did it in a most hackneyed and half hearted way, which were far short of the actual requirement of the liberation struggles. Precisely because of this revisionist approach and attitude of the Soviet leadership the anti-imperialist liberation struggle in Indo-China had been such a prolonged and bloody one. It is evidently clear from all the recent behaviours and practices of the Soviet revisionist leadership that modern revisionism is the most dangerous social support of imperialism-capitalism —it is the compromising force between imperialism and liberation struggles—between capitalism and anti-capitalist revolutionary struggles. So it must not be forgotten for a moment that complete defeat of all trends and varieties of modern revisionism is an indispensable condition to lead the revolutionary struggles to victory".
(P. Era dated 7th June, 1975).

So the Palestinians and the Arab people must bear in mind that as the forging of unity of the entire Arab people against imperialism is essential, similarly they must expose modern revisionism represented by the Soviet revisionist leadership without which they cannot attain victory against imperialism and their liberation.

Export of Capital by Indian Monopoly Groups

(Contd. from Page 6)

and the world Bank and also financing project report of an expert for setting up sugar industry abroad which will be supplied from India under IDBI line of credit. Such reports are almost daily pouring in the bourgeois papers.

And it is in this perspective, The Statesman, a mouth-piece of the Indian monopoly writes in editorial comment on June 7, 1976 the following: "India's progress in industrial technology is increasingly reflected in the number, range and variety of ventures Indian entrepreneurs have set up abroad with local interests..... But the problems involved should not be under-rated .....*In a sense, these ventures have to face the same kind of psychological and other difficulties that foreign collaboration projects in India have to. Great tact is needed in avoiding the odium of neo-colonialism* and unfair trade practices. Many of these countries have genuine foreign exchange constraints and would like to regulate the outflow of funds in the form of dividends and capital repatriation. *Local financial and other difficulties can be easily politicised and it is necessary to deal with them skilfully*".

(Emphasis added-Ed. p. Era)

So according to this bourgeois mouth-piece, 'great tact' is needed to

(Contd. to Page 8)

PRESS CLIPPINGS

"Leaders of the Seven Left Parties, including the CPI(M), the RSP, the FB and the SP met in Calcutta on Friday and finalised a document incorporating their views on the proposed change in the country's constitution. The differences of opinion on the 'Right to property' clause were resolved on the day by striking a compromise on the issue. The view finally adopted by the leaders in this regard was that for "vested interests" there should be no "fundamental right to property."

—Amrita Bazar Patrika, June 5, '76.

● ● ●

... ...
... ...

—The Central Government has prohibited any strike in the Neyveli Lignite Corporation in connection with any industrial dispute for six months from June 21.

—The Hindu, June 21,

Special Representative, July 4: Survey of Labour Bureau, Govt. of India reveals that from July '75 to May '76, about 32 lakhs 50 thousand man days have been lost due to various reasons in West Bengal. Out of this, 24 lakhs 42 thousand man-days have been lost owing to lock-out and closures declared by the management themselves. 8 lakhs 3 thousand man-days have been lost in West Bengal for labour strike. Only four provinces have been included in the said survey of bureau of labour. .

—Satyayug, July 5.

● ● ●

Mr. K. V. Raghunatha Reddy, Labour Minister, today admitted in the Rajya Sabha that it was very difficult to evolve a national minimum wage for agricultural workers at present, reports Samachar.

—Business Standard, May 22.

Many landlords in Assam are still depriving the farm labourers of the statutory minimum daily wages, a spokesman of the Assam Rural Workers' Union said here (Gauhati) today. The rate varies between Rs. 2·50 and Rs. 3·50 against the statutory minimum of Rs. 6·00, he said...What was more deplorable, he said, was that both the Centre and the State had defaulted on this score. The Central agricultural farm at Koklabari in Barpeta subdivision, employing about 750 permanent and 250 seasonal farm labourers, was paying Rs. 4·50 per day. The Assam Agricultural University at Jorhat, which employed about 1,000 farm labourers, was also paying them at the same rate, he added.

—Patriot, June 1.

● ● ●

... ...
... ...

A massive stock of 17 million to 18 million tonnes of foodgrains—a record since independence—is expected to be built up by Government agencies by the end of next month, reports Samachar.

—Business Standard, June 14.

The Canadian Government has made approximately $ 46 million worth of food aid grant to India for the fiscal year 1976-77.

—The Times of India June 76.

The Food Corporation of India is purchasing 10,000 tonnes of Egyptian rice as a part of the Indo-Egyptian trade protocol for 1976.

—Financial Express, June 12.

"The World Bank feels that to maintain foodgrains price stablity and supply through the public distribution system, India will need to import about 5-7 million tonnes of foodgrains a year for the next few years."

—Business Standard May 22.

● ● ●

The permanent mission of India to the UN to-day rejected charges by the International League of Human Rights that its government had violated the UN Charter and Human Right Conventions following the declaration of the Emergency, reports Samachar.

....In a recent memorandum to the Secretary-General, the League asked for investigations by the UN. The Mission in a press release issued to day characterised the League's allegations as "groundless"...The Press release said "To claim that the reasons given by the government of India for proclaiming a State of Emergency in conformity with its constitution are legally and morally inadequate is to display total lack of comprehension of the unique provisions of the Indian Constitution."

—Statesman-9. 6. 76.

Union Commerce Minister, D. P. Chattopadhyaya, said in Calcutta that he found it significant that not a single country from Morocco to Philippines, which became independent between 1945 and 1965, had been able to maintain all the five features of 'Whitehall-White House pattern of Democracy. The five features are multi-party system, independent judiciary, periodic elections, free trade unions and free press.

—The Statesman June 27.

● ● ●

....
....

Land reform adviser to the Union Government, S. N. Dwivedi, said in Simla on June 24 that the surplus land estimates would fall far short of the expected targets of four million acres. Distribution of lands of different categories would also not be completed by June 30, 1976.

He told reporters that large scale benami transactions by big landlords and the state's failure to check the filing of false returns would result in a shortfall in surplus land estimates. He said land records in many states were yet to be updated.

—Patriot, June 25.

The revenue department of the Punjab Government has not been able to complete even the scrutiny of land returns. According to the revenue minister, Umrao Singh, the department has now directed divisional commissioners to have a second look at those land transactions which were earlier allowed. The problem of benami transactions is still a big hurdle in finding the really surplus chunks of land.

—Patriot, June 21.

New Delhi, June 13—India and the Soviet Union today pledged to "break new ground" in collaboration to meet the needs of the rapid advance of economic co-operation between the two. In the joint declaration issued here and in Moscow today at the end of Mrs. Gandhi's five day visit to the Soviet Union the two countries expressed their firm intention to continue to develop and strengthen economic ties.

—Statesman 14.6.76

"Indian shipping circles are worried over the increasing inroads made by Soviet shipping lines in some of their established trade."

—Business Standard, May 22.

—The President Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and the Prime Minister have expressed the hope that the friendly relations and co-operation between India and the USA would be strengthened to their mutual benefit.

—The Statesman, July 2.

● ● ●

A five-year plan is being drawn up for the reorganisation and modernisation of the Sikkim police, according to the police Commissioner, Mr. P. B. Khurana.

—The Times of India June 4.

—West Bengal IG of Police has issued a circular to the police force in the State instructing them to undertake extensive 'padayatras' as a regular practice. It could also result in effecting substantial saving of petrol.

—Patriot, June 16.

Export of Capital by Indian monopoly Groups

(Contd. from Page 7)

avoid the 'odium of neo-colonialism' that can be attached to the Indian joint ventures abroad in the same manner as it can be attached to foreign collaboration projects in Indian market. It therefore, counsels the Indian capitalists to deal skilfully with the financial and other difficulties that can be "easily politicised" in foreign markets. It is therefore giving admission to the past experiences with their foreign investments that Indian monopolists had to suffer in different Afro-Asian countries like Ethiopia, Uganda, Burma etc.

But the funniest thing is that while this bourgeois mouth-piece gives admission to the fact of 'neo-colonialism' that may be associated with Indian capital invested abroad obviously with the intention of reaping profit at the cost of labour power and raw materials there, CPI(M) has come forward to deny this fact.

CPI(M)'s defence outdoing that of the bourgeois spokesmen therefore stands out in bold relief with all its rank opportunism and reactionary purpose true to the trend of social democracy. Whether the Indian bourgeoisie will engage the wiseacres of People's Democracy in their defence which not even the leader-writers of the Statesman or the economists of the FICCI could do so 'nicely' is entirely their affair but let us sum up our discussion with the important lesson that Lenin has left for the Marxists to remember! *"The capitalists partition the world*, not out of personal malice but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method *in order to get profits.* And *they partition it 'in proportion to capital,' 'in proportion to strength'* for there cannot be any other method of division under the system of commodity prduction and capitalism. But *strength varies with the degree of economic and political development".*

—(Lenin—Imperialism Ch. V. Emphasis added-Ed. P. Era)

Edited & Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48, Lenin Sarani and Printed by him at Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Private Limited, 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Cal-13.